

ligious" newspaper; but as it is not a "denominational" matter, as equally touching Christians of all sorts, I have concluded that what I have to say will, with your permission, appear most fitly in your pages, which address the general public.

With the temperance movement I profess the sincerest sympathy, and I feel that I am but acting the part of a true friend in my present endeavour to keep it free from one of those mischievous excrescences that threaten not only to impair its beneficent operation, but to turn it into an enemy of Christianity—a modern form of Manicheism.

An unhappy symptom of this danger is seen in the growing disposition not only to disuse but to denounce wine, or, as the tautological phrase is fermented wine, in the Holy Communion. To show that I am not proceeding to fight a man of straw, your own columns of 10th August will suffice, where we are informed that the parish of All Saints, Cleveland, is threatened with disruption on this question; the leader of one part, "denouncing the employment of the fermented grape juice in Church as an opening wedge to dissipation and drunkenness for the young and weak-headed members of the congregation." In a number of the *Orillia Packet* during the present year a clergyman of this diocese, whose name it would not be kind to introduce here, writes some frightful nonsense in justification of his own departure from the practice of the Church of England and the whole Catholic Church. Dr. Norman Kerr, at the late Church Congress at Derby, said he would refuse to prescribe for any inebriate who, for any reason, even religious, tasted an alcoholic drink. An Irish Presbyterian divinity professor has said in a speech before the General Assembly: "A peculiar theory of temperance has led to a very grave modification of the most sacred of all the ordinances of Christianity. Some of our sessions, yielding to what they regard as conscientious scruples, have either abolished the use of wine in the Lord's Supper altogether, or have adopted the medial course of allowing, in addition, the use of a mixture alleged to be the unfermented juice of the grape." No wonder that he should have to add that "this change has proved a fertile source of discord." At our November meeting of Synod last year I spoke in deprecation of the profanity of recommending "buttermilk instead of wine for the sacrament;" and a Toronto temperance paper was polite enough to send me a number noticing my speech, and assuring me that they should have no hesitation in preferring the "buttermilk" to the wine. And here and there the clergy find persons so misled by this false teaching as to refuse to partake of the Holy Communion. In the diocese of Lincoln, the learned Bishop Wordsworth has forbidden this use of grape juice, which was creeping in here and there. But all these instances, painfully sufficient as they are, might have been wholly superseded by quoting a most painful sentence from the "Temperance Bible Commentary":—"We here reach," it says, "the last pinch of the argument. Did the Saviour understand the law, or did He not? Did He observe the law, or break it? If He used fermented liquor He must, either ignorantly or intentionally, have broken it?" Thus the whole question is audaciously assumed here, without so much as a veil of reverence for our Lord himself. I think that under these circumstances there is need, and it is high time to address the understanding, and to alarm the conscience of the Christian public, lest a great evil, under the patronage of zealous but misguided men, grow to a dangerous strength before it is half perceived. To corrupt or abolish the divinest means of grace, specially ordained for the "strengthening and refreshing of our souls," and that in the supposed interests of temperance, would be a painful application of the mad rule, "propter vitam perdere causas vivendi," for the sake of one particular virtue to destroy gracious help to all virtues. With your permission, therefore, I will endeavour in a few letters to demonstrate the baselessness of the miserable quotation from the "Temperance Commentary," and of the idea that unfermented grape juice is the proper element for the Holy Eucharist.

I end with a quotation from a learned article in the *Presbyterian Review* (N. Y.) for January last, of which I shall make some use:—"One of the most devoted and successful advocates of temper-

ance, the late Dr. John Edgar, of Belfast, when he heard and read of certain zealots who would make the drinking of wine a sin *per se* and would exclude genuine wine from the Table of the Lord, gave utterance to this remark, 'When the devil cannot upset the coach, he mounts the box and drives.'"

JOHN CARRY.

Port Perry, 15th Nov., 1882.

THE STORY OF THE NAG'S HEAD.

BY F. P. S.

WE know that one of the most important things in the Church of England, if not *the* most important, is the validity of her Holy Orders. The most important, because on this hinges the validity of the Sacraments, for without due authority these sacraments would not only be meaningless, but valueless. Without valid Orders, our consecrations, ordinations and confirmations, would be but dumb shows. This is our stronghold which Romanists are continually attacking, but which only results in their leaders being inwardly convinced of the impregnability of our position. They would tell us that not having a commission stamped with Apostolic authority, our children do not at their baptism become "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven;" that in the Holy Eucharist no invisible Christ comes to strengthen our bodies with the Bread of Life; that our marriages receive not the blessing of Holy Church; and that our dead lie in unanointed graves.

The seeker after truth naturally enquires, "what grounds have the Romanists for such assertions, which, if true, would shake a great nation's faith in what we firmly believe to be the purest branch of Christ's Church on earth, and which would fill our minds with perplexing doubts?"

Let us then look into these assertions—we cannot call them arguments, for they have not a shadow of reason in them—and see how often they have vanished before that light of research into which Romanists dare not enter.

Let us investigate the celebrated "Nag's Head Fable," one of the most senseless and puerile inventions of Rome for attacking the Orders of the Church of England.

After the short reign of Queen Mary, her half-sister Elizabeth was placed upon the throne of England. Two days after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, died, leaving vacant the chair of St. Augustine. The first duty of the new queen was to fill the vacancy of the Archiepiscopal See. The Dean and Chapter of Canterbury having met and having received its *conseil d'elire*, the man whom they elected to the Archiepiscopate was the Rev. Dr. Matthew Parker. The queen then issued an imperial mandate to certain Bishops to consecrate Dr. Parker.

Now what Romanists want us to believe is this, that with every Cathedral and Church in all England at their disposal, with a solemn ordinal suited to their views, with three lawfully consecrated Bishops, knowing that watchful enemies were on every side ready to find a flaw in their proceedings, and knowing that party feeling was both violent and unscrupulous, we are asked to believe that these Bishops went to a tavern and made the consecration of Archbishop Parker a profane farce. Would Queen Elizabeth for a moment have tolerated such proceedings? Would Parliament or Convocation have permitted these men to take their seats in either of these bodies after such an unhallowed transaction? Would there have been no public outcry against such an outrage? Are we to believe that Archbishop Parker and his associates were insane, or do Romanists think that we have lost our reason? Not once, not twice but hundreds of times has this monstrous fable been produced by Romanists as an argument against the validity of the Orders of the Church of England.

In the first place, this story was not heard for at least forty-five years after the consecration took place. It is first found in a controversial book written by an exiled Roman Priest by the name of Holywood. The story is afterwards found and repeated in no less than five different ways, each

version contradicting the other four in respect to the number of consecrators present, the dates, and the proceedings, and on this as on another occasion, "their witness agreed not together." The well-known antiquary, Mr. Tierney, and the learned Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard, both deny the truth of the story. The former says, "I must own however, that after a careful perusal of all that has been written on this subject (the Nag's Head Consecration) I am compelled to adopt the opposite opinion," i. e., from Mr. Dodd's, who in his history credits it. The same gentleman refers to it again and calls it "the supposed mummery in Cheapside." We cannot help, therefore, believing that this Nag's Head story is a futile, false and contradictory invention.

But we are told that we have no proof of the consecration of Dr. Barlow, one of the four consecrators of Archbishop Parker, from the fact that his consecration is not recorded in the register of Lambeth. Does this prove anything either way? Fortunately, we have other proofs of the consecration of Bishop Barlow. He was installed in the House of Lords, June 30th, 1536, as Bishop of St. David's. According to law, he could not be a spiritual peer until after his consecration. Since the time of Edward III., no one had sat in the House of Lords as a Bishop-elect. In the year 1553 he occupied a seat in convocation as Bishop of Bath and Wells. In the year 1542 he was one of the consecrators of Arthur Bulkeley. The fact of his consecration not being recorded does not therefore prove that he had not received the Apostolic Commission. During the Primacy of Archbishop Warham, twenty-six consecrations took place, and six of these are not to be found. The consecration of the notable Gardiner is not to be found in the Lambeth register. But after all, it is not necessary to prove Barlow's consecration, for only three Bishops are the required canonical number for consecration. There were present at Archbishop Parker's consecration, three others besides Barlow, viz, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale. There can be no doubt of their consecration, as we have the dates of their consecrations, and the names of their consecrators, and this succession we can trace back to the Apostles themselves. To doubt then Archbishop Parker's consecration on account of Dr. Barlow is as silly as it is presuming, and only proves one thing—that the Romanists not having faith in one side of the Nag's Head story must needs invent a new objection.

As if the two above objections were not enough, Romanists further tell us that the ordinal *may* have been incomplete, and so *perhaps* might have invalidated the consecration. They claim that we enlarged and improved it afterwards. But this proves nothing, for we claim that "every Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies," and no objection can possibly be made to our service—(1), because we dropped certain non-essential ceremonies of the sixth and even as late as the twelfth centuries, and (2), because the words "Priest" and "Bishop" did not occur in the actual form of ordaining. In the Roman Pontifical in Episcopal consecration the word "Bishop" is entirely absent. Romanists evidently overlook the fact that the Orders of the Church of England have been admitted valid even by Popes. There is no doubt Pius IV., in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, offered to sanction the Book of Common Prayer, including the Ordinal, if she would receive it from him. The illustrious M. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, Father Davenport of Santa Clara, the well known Dr. Stephen Gough, and many other Roman Catholic divines testify to the validity of our Orders. And we like to receive and hear such opinions, for it shows that even among Romanists themselves there are found men who are ashamed to credit such outrageous inventions as the "Nag's Head Consecration."

QUERIES.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Will you allow me to ask through your columns, the following questions: Is there any authority for

1st. The reader of the Lessons *preaching* them: looking up at the congregation frequently, as if